

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. All claims were rejected. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

**I. Objection to the Title**

The office action states that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The applicant respectfully disagrees. The title is DIGITAL VIDEO EDITING DEVICE AND METHOD, which corresponds to the claims. Any narrower title than the present title may cause the scope of the patent to be narrowed, so the applicant respectfully disagrees with changing the title.

**II. Objection to the Specification**

The specification was objected to due to an typographical error. This error has been corrected, which overcomes the rejection.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1-11, 15-17, and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-11, 15-17, and 19 were rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brais (U.S. 5,999,936) in view of Nomura (6,819,934).

**CLAIM 1**

Claim 1 is independent and is directed toward:

A digital video device, comprising:

a processor; and

a digital random-access memory communicating with said processor and including an edit tag library storing a plurality of edit tags and a video storage storing digital video data comprising one or more video segments and one or more embedded edit tags, with said one or more embedded edit tags being selected from said edit tag library and specifying edit operations to be performed on said digital video data.

The office action states that Brais discloses edit tags specifying edit operations to be performed on digital data. The applicant disagrees with this conclusion. Brais discloses commands that may be performed during image capture, such as entering dictation, image acquisition, and report generation. However, none of the commands are edit operations performed in digital video data as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, these commands are directed toward camera operation and have no bearing on editing video data as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, Brais does not disclose "edit tags being selected from said edit tag library and specifying edit operations to be performed on said digital video data" as claimed in claim 1.

Furthermore, the office action states that Brais does not disclose edit tags being in the same file as image data. The office action states that Nomura discloses edit tags being in the same file as image data. The applicant respectfully disagrees. The tags cited in Nomura relate to playback and the like of data and do not relate to editing video data as claimed in claim 1. The applicant notes Fig. 2 of Nomura, which shows that the "edit" information is simply related to playback and not to specifying edit operations as claimed in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, neither Brais, Nomura, nor their combination disclose "embedded edit tags being selected from said edit tag library and specifying edit operations to be performed on said digital video data" as claimed in claim 1. Thus the references do not disclose all the elements of claim 1 and cannot render claim 1 obvious. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

## CLAIM 2

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is directed toward:

The digital video device of claim 1, further comprising:  
a sound transducer receiving sound and generating an audio signal in response;  
an audio processor communicating with said processor and said sound transducer, said audio processor receiving said audio signal, extracting one or more voice commands from said audio signal, extracting one or more edit tags from said one or more voice commands, and passing said one or more voice commands and said one or more edit tags to said processor.

Claim 2 includes an element of extracting edit commands from voice commands. As set forth above, neither cited reference discloses edit tags as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, neither reference can disclose edit tags being extracted from one or more voice commands as claimed in claim 2.

Based on the foregoing, the cited references cannot render claim 1 obvious. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

**CLAIMS 3-8**

Claims 3-8 are dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**CLAIM 9**

Claim 9 is independent and is directed toward:

A video edit method for a digital video device, comprising the steps of:  
generating one or more edit tags; and  
embedding said one or more edit tags into digital video data stored in  
a digital memory;

wherein said one or more edit tags delineate one or more edit operations to be performed on one or more video segments of said digital video data.

As set forth above in the rebuttal to the rejection of claim 1, neither Brais, Nomura, nor their combination disclose edit tags wherein "said one or more edit tags delineate one or more edit operations to be performed on one or more video segments of said digital video data" as claimed in claim 9. Therefore, the combination cannot render claim 9 obvious.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

**CLAIMS 10, 11, 15, AND 16**

Claims 10, 11, 15, and 16 are dependent on claim 9 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**CLAIM 17**

A video edit method for a digital video device, comprising the steps of:  
generating one or more edit tags;  
embedding said one or more edit tags into digital video data stored in  
a digital memory, with said one or more edit tags delineating one or more  
edit operations to be performed on one or more video segments of said  
digital video data;  
scanning said digital video data stored in a digital memory for  
embedded edit tags; and  
performing an edit operation specified by each found edit tag.

As set forth above, neither reference nor their combination disclose the claimed edit tags. Therefore, the references cannot disclose "one or more edit tags delineating one or more edit operations to be performed on one or more video segments of said digital video data" as claimed in claim 17. Likewise, the references cannot disclose "performing an edit operation specified by each found edit tag" as also claimed in claim 17.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

**CLAIMS 19**

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 17 and is deemed allowable by way of its dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

**III. Rejection of Claims 12-14 and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 12-14 and 18 were rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brais (U.S. 5,999,936) in view of Nomura (6,819,934) as applied to claims 9 and 17 and further in view of Dwyer (U.S. 6,671,567).

Claims 12-14 and 18 are dependent on allowed base claims and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

December 5, 2005

By: R.W.Nelson  
Robert Nelson  
Registration No. 37,898  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 298-9888